



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,065	08/31/2000	George E. Corbin	POU920000026US1	2966
7590	04/20/2005		EXAMINER	
William A Kinnaman Jr IBM Corporation IPLAW 2455 South Road M/S P386 Poughkeepsie, NY 12601			BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**MAILED**

**APR 20 2005**

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



**Technology Center 2100**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/652,065

Filing Date: August 31, 2000

Appellant(s): CORBIN ET AL.

William A. Kinnaman, Jr.  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 02/03/05.

*HL*

*\$*

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

The following is a listing of the evidence (e.g., patents, publications, Official Notice, and admitted prior art) relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

**<http://www.webreference.com/js/column24/>, "Persistence", created**

**08/28/98, pp. 1-39, (Hereafter "WebReference")**

**(9) *Grounds of Rejection***

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by <http://www.webreference.com/js/column24/> "Persistence", created 08/28/98, pages 1-39. (Hereafter stated as WebReference).

-In regard to independent claims 1, 6, and 9, WebReference teaches a client application (Internet Explorer 5.0 Browser)(Page 1) that displays a form hypertext document where a user can enter user data into the form and where said client application can locally save displayed documents (Pages 16-17: Hard Disk Persistence, <http://www.webreference.com/js/column24/snapshot.html>). WebReference also teach a method for providing local data persistence for the client application wherein the client application receives user data from the user (form data), receives a save command from the user to save the user data (Page 16: 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph), and in response to the save command creating a new hypertext document (saved file with persistent variables) containing the user data and displaying a message prompting the user to save the new document using said function for locally saving documents (Page 16-17: Hard Disk Persistence, <http://www.webreference.com/js/column24/snapshot.html> & Page 19: 1st Paragraph, User Data Persistence,

<http://www.webreference.com/js/column24/userdata.html>). WebReference further teaches wherein said new hypertext document contained a script function (Page 17):

```
<SCRIPT CLASS="saveSnapshot" ID="persistentScript">
  var persistentVariable;
</SCRIPT>
```

that becomes activated when said new hypertext document was loaded (clicking the "load" button) to perform a desired restoration function (refresh the form entry with persistent variables)(Page 17: 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph).

**-In regard to dependent claim 2**, WebReference teaches wherein the Internet Explorer 5.0 browser (client application)(Page 1) receives said first HTML file (hypertext document) from a server (Page 16: 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraphs: Hard Disk Persistence, <http://www.webreference.com/js/column24/snapshot.html>).

**-In regard to dependent claim 3**, WebReference teaches wherein said hypertext documents are HTML documents (Page 16: Hard Disk Persistence, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraphs <http://www.webreference.com/js/column24/snapshot.html>).

**-In regard to dependent claims 4, 7, and 10**, WebReference teaches wherein said message is created as a part of said new hypertext document (Page 16: Hard Disk Persistence, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph <http://www.webreference.com/js/column24/snapshot.html>).

**-In regard to dependent claims 5, 8, and 11**, WebReference teaches receiving a restore (load) command from the user (Page 17: Hard Disk Persistence, Last Two Paragraphs <http://www.webreference.com/js/column24/snapshot.html>) to restore the previously saved data and in response to receiving the command repopulating the document with said previously saved data.

-**In regard to dependent claims 12, 14, and 16,** WebReference teaches wherein said script function was a JavaScript function (JavaScript feature)(Page 1: 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph).

-**In regard to dependent claims 13, 15, and 17,** WebReference teaches wherein said script function becomes activated when loaded (clicking the “load” button) to repopulate (refresh) the first hypertext document (form entry) with said user data (persistent variables)(Page 17: 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph).

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

Applicant's arguments filed 02/03/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the arguments on pages 4-7, regarding independent claims 1, 6, and 9 with respect to the WebReference, the examiner feels that applied reference is proper under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). The applicant argues that only a single document was involved in WebReference rather than dynamically generating a new document containing user data and displaying a save prompt. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant and believes WebReference does indeed teach these limitations.

WebReference teaches a client application (i.e. a user browser such as Internet Explorer 5.0)(WebReference: Page 1) that displays a form hypertext document (“Enter a text you want to be persisted:”) where a user can enter form data into the form (“targeted towards the persistence of form data”)(WebReference: Pages 16-17) and wherein the client application can locally save the displayed document (“try to save this

form to your hard disk. Select the Save As option..."). WebReference also teach receiving user data from a user ("Enter the text you want to be persisted:", "Enter another text you want to be persisted:", etc)(WebReference: Pages 16-17), receiving a save command to save the user entered data ("try to save this form to your hard disk. Select the Save As option...", "When the user saves the file onto his or her hard disk", etc) (WebReference: Pages 16-17), and in response to receiving a save command dynamically creating a new hypertext document (i.e. the locally saved file utilizing the "Save As" functionality or by another way such as the "Save Button", which maintains the persistent variables) containing the user data and displaying a message prompting the user to save the new document using said functionality for locally saving documents (WebReference: Pages 16-17). The examiner asserts that the saved document with user entered form data was indeed a newly dynamically created document in that it maintained new user entered values persisted in the document that the original form document did not maintain. The examiner notes that wherein a new "Save As" file name could have been utilized as suggest by Applicant (Arguments: Page 7: Lines 3-5) the file would also be construed as a new hypertext document based on different naming attributes. Wherein WebReference teaches displaying a message prompting the user to save the new document for locally saving documents, the Examiner believes this functionality to be identical to the functionality used to save the first hypertext document utilizing the "Save As" option from the file menu which was an inherent available prompt of Internet Explorer 5.0 (WebReference: Page 16).

Regarding the arguments on pages 7-8, regarding dependent claims 13, 15, and 17 with respect to the WebReference, the Applicant argues that WebReference does not teach that the script function contained in the new hypertext document becomes active when loaded to repopulate the first hypertext document with said user data. The Examiner notes that as claimed the script function was not a repopulation function but was only loaded to repopulate. The script function as described in WebReference persists only persistent variables entered by the user and when the user saves the file on their hard disk the script was utilized to save the persistent variables (i.e. saved in the new hypertext document). If the script with entered persistent variables were not saved in the new hypertext document then they would not be persistent.

WebReference also teaches that the script function becomes active when loading the form (“clicking the load button”) by allowing to refresh the first hypertext document with the persistent variables which were stored via the script (WebReference: Page 17).

Since the script function of WebReference was part of the of the “loading” process of persistent variables it therefore has an active effect on repopulating the first hypertext document.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Art Unit: 2178

Respectfully submitted,



STEPHEN HONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

ALB  
April 17, 2005

Conferees

Stephen Hong, Supervisory Patent Examiner for GAU 2178 

Joseph Feild, Supervisory Patent Examiner for GAU 2176 

William A Kinnaman Jr  
IBM Corporation IPLAW  
2455 South Road M/S P386  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601